EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

Routing Slip

TO:		CONTRACTOR OF	ACTIO	N MINFO	DATE	INITIAL
	-2]				To the same of	
-	2		4	2 TV 2 1	7	Zerone.
	E 3	1 4 4 4 7 2 2		まり、安全		Man Track
	*4	D/ICS	+ +44	* Vesta		Cate 1 4 2
	豪5	The same of the same of the				1100000
	裳6	DDA	400	\$ 12 6 A 40		
	Ž.	DDO W	A VALUE OF	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		20.000
	氢8	DDS&T	100		1 (7.00)	LESS COLUMN
	¥9.			1		A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR
	10	GC:		10 16 Townson	- Contraction	THE PERSON
21872	. 1,1 ,	IG.	- Comment		Great August Street	THE PERSONAL PROPERTY.
	,1 2 .	Compt	1	- California (The second second	The second second
	13:	D/EEO			300 W 400 W	
	14	D/Pers	2000	Service Co.		A PART OF THE PART
	15	D/OEA	- birraph rate	ACT DATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PA	A STANSON	
	16	C/PAD/OEA				One of
變	17:	SA/IA :	70112 C		13406.04	
變L	18	AO/DCI	A PLACE	42.00		24
	19	C/IPD/OIS	3451	/		200
	20	"ES	-	7		
	21	************		17.00		*
L2	22					**************************************
		SUSPENSE	1		A. Carrier	
	.C 3	Market 1875	Contract of the last of the la	-bole	13 Table	
ırks:	3			* # ###		
- 6	513					7 - 12

MExecutive Secretary

Executive Registry 3-4892

7 October 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Intelligence

FROM:

Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT:

Manned Space Station

The Cabinet will soon consider the national security need for US space operations to include a permanently manned space station. The justification, for the rather large proposed expenditures will be heavily influenced by our intelligence assessment of Soviet military goals and efforts in space in the 1990s. However, this threat assessment needs to be balanced against the other major Soviet military threats that the US and its allies will be facing during the same time period. For instance if the Soviets greatly enhance their ground warfare capability throughout the 1980s, the US and its NATO allies would be required to spend billions of dollars more on both ground weapons research and production than we now intend. If more were to be allocated for space, it could draw down on this type of future requirement.

I would like OSWR in concert with SOVA to conduct a future weapons assessment of the overall military threat that the Soviets are likely to pose during the 1990s. This future threat model should describe the kinds of weapons by their general mission objectives, e.g., spacebased to include ASAT and BDM; naval to include SSBN, antiship, ASW and aircraft carriers; ground to include tank SRBM, tactical air defense, etc. Furthermore, the make up of each mission area should be displayed in relative size for the 1985 and the 1995 time periods. "Pie charts" should suffice to show these proportions. OSWR should attempt to indicate how the relative military threat will change for each, showing whether the threat to US/Western forces will increase or decrease in that mission area.

I like the approach taken by the OSWR/SOVA team in developing the weaponmission analysis in the draft NIE 11-12 work and would like to have the two offices work together on this task along the same lines.

William J. Casey

DCI **EXEC** REG

25X1